



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SHAKESPEAREAN PLAYHOUSES. With 48 maps, plans, views of theatres and other illustrations. By Joseph Quincy Adams, Ph.D. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company. Pp. 473. Professor Joseph Quincy Adams' book on the genesis and his-

tory of the Pre-Restoration playhouses is an immeasurable advance on anything yet written on the subject. Not only does it present with unwonted lucidity and grasp an admirable synthesis of all previously ascertained data but it also comprises many new and vital details which are trumpet-tongued in their testimony to the penetrative research and fine deductive powers of its author. Such, indeed, is the general accuracy and completeness of the work that as a handy work of reference it is not likely to be superseded. If only because of its masterly elucidation of the relative sites of the first and second Blackfriars, a point rendered clear by Professor Adams' well-conceived ground-plans of the old monastic buildings, it merits a place in every Shakespeare library. But the book has divers other sterling qualities. For the first time since Malone established a longevous, slavishly-followed precedent by inept handling of the tangled skein of early theatrical finance, the important question of the division and allocation of playhouse receipts receives clarifying and convincing (if not perhaps thoroughly exhaustive) treatment. For the first time also the map-views of old London are given thoroughly scientific examination, with the startling result that most of the conclusions of previous investigators have been rendered nugatory. By dint of demonstrating that no map-view of the first half of the seventeenth century can be taken as evidence for the precise period when it was issued, practically every such view having been executed from much earlier surveys, Professor Adams has succeeded in showing that the view which has hitherto been taken to represent Shakespeare's Globe in reality depicts the Rose. Great, however, as is his skill, it has not enabled him to explain away certain contradictory items of evidence. Once, indeed, in trying a fall with a formidable crux, he himself becomes contradictory. Over Hollar's *View of London* (1647) he first blows hot and then cold. After remarking that Hollar's sketch of the second Globe is unsatisfactory, (p. 259) he adds "it should be noted that the artist was in banishment from 1643 (at which time the Globe was still standing) until 1652, and hence, in drawing certain buildings, especially those not reproduced in earlier views of London, he may have had to rely upon his memory. This would explain the general vagueness (?) of his representation of the Globe."

Contrast this with what he says on p. 329 about Hollar's sketch of the "Beare bayting," which he champions sturdily against all comers as an accurate view of the Hope. Here he characterises Hollar's *View* as "splendid" and proceeds: "It is hard to believe

that an artist who so carefully represented the famous edifices of the city should have greatly erred in drawing the 'Bear Baiting House'—a structure more curious than they and quite as famous."

But surely the "fame" of the Bear Garden cannot compare with the fame of the Globe—even of the second Globe. Professor Adams cannot have it both ways.

In reproducing Faithorne's view of the "Beare garden" in 1658 and identifying it with the Hope, Professor Adams omits to note that its details are seriously at variance with Hollar's, a discrepancy which can only be accounted for by accepting the hypothesis that Faithorne had the audacity to base on a survey almost half a century old. This hypothesis receives some bolstering from the fact that Faithorne's Bear Garden disagrees with all previous seventeenth-century views of buildings so called but confirms the details given in Norden. Even then we cannot be assured of Hollar's accuracy. How little dependence is to be placed in him is shewn by the circumstance that he places the Globe immediately opposite Blackfriars wharf, a position really occupied, when the theatre existed, by the Swan.

Professor Adams occasionally irritates by arriving at conclusions without stating his evidence, a defect no doubt attributable to his serious limitations of space. Less pardonable is his adoption of Fleay's reprehensible trick of stating conjecture in terms of pure fact. In discussing Burbage's intention on proceeding to build the second Blackfriars—a matter on which we know absolutely nothing—he writes (p. 185):—"The open-air structure which he had designed in 1576, and which had since been copied in all public theatres, had serious disadvantages in that it offered no protection from the weather. Burbage now resolved to provide a large 'public' playhouse, fully roofed in with the entire audience and the actors protected against the inclemency of the sky and the cold of winter. In short, his dream was of a theatre centrally located, comfortably heated, and, for its age, luxuriously appointed."

If this was his dream and he was so convinced of the disabilities of the type of public theatre which he had initiated, it is curious that his sons did not share his views, and that when they came to build the Globe in succession to the Theater they persisted in following the old, open-air model.

Unless I am greatly mistaken, conjecture again appears in the guise of hard fact on p. 217, where we are told that Kirkham, in 1604, was punished for not getting "the Lord Chamberlain's allowance" to act *Eastward Hoe*. Proof of this statement is imperatively demanded. It has never yet been demonstrated that the Lord Chamberlain had any authority over the theatres so early as 1604.

At pp. 196-7, note 2, our author traverses Professor C. W. Wallace's contention that the second Blackfriars had three galleries

(i.e., a row of boxes and a middle and upper gallery), but here for once Wallace is right. Professor Adams cannot maintain his point unless he can prove that some serious structural alteration of the Blackfriars afterwards took place. We have clear evidence in 1623 that the house had a pit, boxes and two galleries.

Malone's unsupported statement that the motto, "*Totus mundus agit histrionem*" was placed over the sign of the Globe has been cheerfully taken as gospel by a long line of more or less unthinking commentators, but this affords no reason why so cautious an investigator as Professor Adams should accept it (p. 248). The motto was placed over the proscenium of the Theatre Royal, Drury Lane, early in the seventeenth century, but there is no evidence to show that it had been utilised inside or outside by any earlier theatre.

One cannot see on what grounds Professor Adams accepts the old Quarterly Reviewer's assignment to the Fortune of Orazio Busino's visit in 1617 to a described but un-named theatre (p. 280). It is impossible to reconcile Busino's reference to the "crowd of nobility so very well arrayed that they looked like so many princes, listening as silently and soberly as possible," with other characterisations of the Fortune's audience and particularly with Wright's assertion (p. 303) that the Red Bull and the Fortune were "mostly frequented by citizens and the meaner sort of people." Surely the visit must have been paid to the Blackfriars!

No section of Professor Adams' engrossing book presents so many vital new details or is half so interesting as the chapter in which he deals exclusively with court theatricals. Having had occasion to traverse the same ground some months before these details were given to the world, I have no hesitation in saying that Professor Adams' identification of Inigo Jones's recently discovered designs with the altered Cockpit in court is conclusive. But in making this pronouncement I know full well there will remain some sceptics for whom it will be necessary to explain away some apparently rebutting evidence. Despite the fact that Fisher's Survey, taken in conjunction with Inigo Jones's ground-plan, clearly demonstrates that Inigo altered and enlarged the existing royal Cockpit, by building around it, thus (without removing the original walls) transforming an octagon into a square, Faithorne's view of the Cockpit in court in 1658, (p. 390) published a quarter of a century after the alteration, shows the building in its original octagonal form. But it will doubtless be pointed out by Professor Adams when his book reaches a second edition that Faithorne's general depiction of Whitehall so far tallies with Agas' that it cannot possibly have been made from a contemporary survey. Another objection, however, he will find it more difficult to answer. Agas and Faithorne coincide in placing the royal Cockpit hard by Holbein Gate, but Fisher, in 1665, who was undoubtedly accurate for his period, shows the altered Cockpit in a less confined

position and nearer to St. James's Park. How are we to account for this discrepancy? Does it not appear as if Henry VII's old cockpit—the building depicted by Agas and Faithorne—had been pulled down considerably before 1632, and a new cockpit erected on an adjacent site? One has either to accept this hypothesis or arrive at the conclusion that in Agas and Faithorne the Whitehall Cockpit has been inaccurately placed. Furthermore, notice will have to be taken of Mr. W. Grant Keith's contention that the Cockpit design was not the handiwork of Inigo Jones but of his pupil and (in some respects) successor, John Webb. Unless this can be refuted the design will have to be dated considerably later than 1632.

When Professor Adams is revising the valuable chapter under discussion he should take care to eliminate the entries of 1667 and 1674 cited on pp. 407-8. These do not refer to the Cockpit-in-court, as he asserts, but to a larger court theatre erected in 1665, as Pepys' note of its opening shows, in Whitehall noonhall. One speaks volumes for the accuracy of our author's work when one says that these are the only mistakes of moment in the book.

Finally it may be pointed out that, interesting as is Professor Adams' account of "The Projected Amphitheatre," it fails to advance all the available evidence on the subject. An important document giving details of the various kinds of entertainments it was in contemplation to give at the Amphitheatre was discovered a few years ago by Mr. G. E. P. Arkwright, the well-known musical antiquary, and published in an article contributed over his initials to two successive issues of *Notes and Queries* in December 1914.

W. J. LAWRENCE.

LE MORTE D'ARTHUR OF SIR THOMAS MALORY AND ITS SOURCES. By Vida D. Scudder. Pp. XII+430. New York and London, 1917.

To most students acquainted with Miss Scudder's previous work the present volume will come as a surprise, for they have not been accustomed to count her among the medievalists. Her reputation rests mainly upon various admirable studies in modern literature and the discussion of questions relating to social welfare. But it is not a regrettable thing to have a book like *Le Morte D'Arthur*, strange and mystical as it is, studied by one in close sympathy with the spiritual problems of our day.

Miss Scudder's book is divided into three parts. The first deals mainly with Malory's predecessors in Arthurian romance, both French and English; the second part is devoted to a brief sketch of Malory and his book; the third part considers Malory and his sources. This program is surely broad enough to include everything worth saying, and I hasten to add that the book is written